CERTHICATE OF TH applicant(s): Bernardo Ma	RANSMISSION BY FACS	MILE (37 CFR 1.8)	Docket No. SCB-0006
Application No. 09/470,343	Filing Date 12/22/1999	Examiner Troy Chambers	Group Art Unit
nvention: TITANIUM SE	MICONDUCTOR BRIDGE IG		
		•	1000 000 100 200 0 4 1 Pm
			RECEIVED ITRAL FAX CENTER
			AUG 2 5 2005
			· · · · · ·
t harabu kaslike that this	63 1 68		
I hereby certify that this	•	rview Summary by Applicant(3pgs	•
s being facsimile transmitte	ed to the United States Patent	and Trademark Office (Fax. No.	571 273-8300
on August 25, 20	05		
(Date)			
	•	Jackie Boya (Typed or Printed Name of Person Signature)	nniun Certificate)
•		The B	
	- 	(Signature)	
		•	
	Note: Each paper must hav	e its own certificate of mailing.	
	•		

TRANSMITTAL LETTER (General - Patent Pending)			Docket No. SCB-0006					
In Re Application Of: Bernardo Martinez-Tovar et al.								
Application No.	Filing Date	Examiner	Customer No.	Group Art Unit	Confirmation No.			
09/470,343	12/22/1999	T. Chambers	23413	3641	Committee on No.			
Title: TITANTUA	Title: TITANTUM SEMICONDUCTOR BRIDGE IGNITER							
	•							
<u>TO</u>	THE DIRECTOR OF	THE UNITED STATES PAT	ENT AND TRAD	EMARK OFFICE	E :			
Transmitted herew								
Interview Summ;	ary by Applicant			•				
•								
in the above identified application. No additional fee is required. A check in the amount of is attached. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and credit Deposit Account No. 06-1130 as described below. Charge the amount of improver control in the con								
Frederick A. Spacth Registration No: 33, Customer No: 23413 Telephone No: (860)	793 °		deposited with sufficient poster addressed to C Alexandria, WA 2 August 25, (Date)	the United States ge as first class orninissioner for Par 2313-1450" [37 CFF 2005	3			

SCB-0006

CENTRAL FAX CENTER
AUG 2 5 2005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANT: B. Martinez-Tovar et al) GROUP ART UNIT: 3641
SERIAL NO: 09/470,343) EXAMINER: T. Chambers
FILING DATE: December 22, 1999)
TITLE: TITANIUM SEMICONDUCTOR BRIDGE)
IGNITER)

INTERVIEW SUMMARY BY APPLICANT

Via Facsimile: (571) 273-8300 Date: August 25, 2005

Commissioner For Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir,

This paper is submitted pursuant to 37 CFR 1.133 (b) and MPEP 713.04 (8th Ed. Rev. May 2004) to make of record the substance of a telephone interview on August 18, 2005 between the undersigned and Examiner Chambers regarding the office action mailed June 22, 2005 in the captioned application. The Applicant's reply to the office action will be filed in due course.

MATTERS DISCUSSED

A. Request for Non-final Action

During the interview, the undersigned requested that the "final" status of the June 22 office action be withdrawn because, prior to its mailing, the Applicant submitted a written request for an interview (form PTOL-413A) with the response to the previous

SCB-0006

office action. At the Examiner's request, a duplicate of the interview request form was faxed to the Examiner on August 18, 2005.

B. The citation of the abstract for DE19721929

The Applicant maintains that the abstract is not properly citable because (i) the principal document is available (See MPEP 706.02), (ii) the abstract does not appear to qualify as prior art because of a lack of publication date, and (iii) the Applicant has provided evidence that the portion of the abstract relied upon by the Examiner (a disclosure pertaining to titanium) does not reflect the content of the principal document (which does not appear to disclose titanium). The undersigned also suggested that the improper citation of this reference further justifies issuance of a nonfinal action.

C. "Consisting Essentially Of' in claim 18

The Examiner asserted that "consisting essentially of" would not be given effect in claim 18 because the claim is not drawn to a composition or method and questioned whether the use of "comprising" after "consisting essentially of" negates the exclusionary effect of "consisting essentially of." No supporting authority was cited. The undersigned pointed out where the specification and prior arguments indicate the intended effect of "consisting essentially of."

D. The rejection under 35 U.S.C.\$ 103

The undersigned argued that even if DE19721929 to Weiss et al. (Weiss) was credited with disclosing a titanium bridge instead of the hasnium it actually discloses, the asserted combination with US 4,976,200 to Benson et al. (Benson) would not be obvious because the bridge shown by Benson includes a semiconductor material under the tungsten, whereas the hashium bridge shown by Weiss does not. Instead, Weiss's bridge is disposed directly on a thermally insulating substrate. In addition, Weiss criticizes Benson for placing the tungsten on a non-thermally insulating material. Weiss thus teaches away from the asserted combination. Finally, the semiconductor material of Benson generates

SCB-0006

the plasma; to make the asserted combination would improperly require a significant change in the mode of operation disclosed in one reference or the other.

Respectfully submitted,

Frederick A. Spaeth, Esq. Registration No: 33,793

Attorney for Applicant

Cantor Colburn LLP 55 Griffin Road South Bloomfield, CT 06002 Customer No. 23413

Telephone: (860) 286-2929 Facsimile: (860) 286-0115